

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-29, 31-42 and 44-48 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-29, 31-42 and 44-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wyler et al. (U.S. Patent 7,047,033) (hereinafter “Wyler”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, Wyler fails to disclose that the server is further configured to plug a converter module into a framework configured to accept one or more pluggable modules. With respect to this feature of claim 1, the Examiner cites “insertion of M2O script” for the converter process, “a core process, col. 11, line 38” for the framework and “Fig. 1, scripts 20, 30, 40” for the pluggable modules. Applicants submit that neither the cited scripts nor the core process of Wyler correspond to plugging a converter module into a framework configured to accept one or more pluggable modules. More specifically, while the cited core process (an application) may call three different functions based on web source page types (markup languages, java/java script languages, and rich text format), **there is no indication in Wyler that the application is configured to accept one or more pluggable modules or that the different functions are pluggable modules themselves.** Applicants submit that these functions are instead core integral elements of the application described by Wyler and do not teach or suggest the framework recited in claim 1. Thus, Wyler fails to teach this element of claim 1.

With further regard to claim 1, Wyler fails to disclose that the converter module is further configured to receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device. With respect to this limitation of claim 1, the Examiner cites column 21, line 59-column 22, line 17 as well as column 23, line 44 –

column 25, line 10. The cited portions relate to how filtering criteria may be retrieved from a database for web pages to be displayed on a PDA or cell phone. As described in column 21 lines 56-60, the application “retrieves data from the user-indicated URL on the Internet, passes the data, filters the parsed data and then processes it”. Applicants note that Wyler’s filtering pertains to removal of objects from web pages, and that the filter settings may be specified by the user with respect to which types of objects may be included or excluded (listed examples include banner advertisements, image advertisements, unrelated site internal links, bookmarks, external links, sound objects, movies, etc.). Thus, the cited portion relates to how user preferences may be used during the conversion process to filter out portions of the web page. **Clearly, filtering of data (before it is provided to the small device) is not pertinent to the converter module receiving a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device.** Applicants remind the Examiner that the document recited in Applicants’ claim is generated from the converter module to a small device format and provided to the small device by the server, and that the converter module is also configured to receive a modified version of that same document in the small device format from the small device. Wyler fails to disclose this feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, Wyler fails to disclose that the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format. The Examiner cites the same portions of Wyler as that of the previous limitation of claim 1. Similar to arguments above, the cited portions do not pertain to this feature of claim 1. Wyler’s user preferences used to filter out portions of a web page clearly does not teach that the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format. Correspondingly, Wyler clearly fails to teach this limitation of claim 1.

For at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1, and those claims dependent therefrom, is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Independent claims 16, 29, and 42 include similar limitations as claim 1, and

so the above arguments apply with equal force to claims 16, 29, and 42. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, the rejection of claims 16, 29, and 42, and those claims dependent therefrom, is not supported by the prior art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Additionally, Applicants assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-10600/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: May 7, 2007